



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—ON A PROBABLE ERROR IN PLUTARCH.

PER. C. 23.

When Clisthenes had succeeded in introducing his reforms in the constitution, his rival Isagoras could hope to overcome him only by invoking the aid of the Spartan King Cleomenes. This aid Cleomenes first rendered by sending a herald and demanding the expulsion of the accursed—*τοὺς ἐναγέας*—that is, the family of the Alcmaeonidae, to which Clisthenes belonged, who were supposed to be tainted with guilt in consequence of the destruction of Cylon and his followers by Megacles, the great-grandfather of Clisthenes. Clisthenes retired at once; and Cleomenes arriving soon after with a small force, found himself master of the city. The senate, however, as constituted by Clisthenes, refused to be dissolved and make way for a new body of three hundred oligarchs whom Cleomenes desired to take charge of the government; and after a short siege Cleomenes and Isagoras were forced to abandon the Acropolis and retire to Sparta. Cleomenes then resolved to invade Attica with a competent force; and summoned allies from the various states of Peloponnesus. At the same time he arranged by negotiation a plan for a simultaneous invasion of Attica by the Boeotians and the Chalcidians of Euboea. As soon as these preparations were made the Peloponnesian force advanced under the command of the two kings, Cleomenes and Demaratus, as far as Eleusis. But Cleomenes had hitherto kept the purpose of the expedition concealed from his Peloponnesian allies. When it came to be known, as there was no unfriendly feeling towards Athens among them, it caused much dissatisfaction; and the Corinthians set the example of withdrawing their contingent. Demaratus too, for some unspecified reason, renounced the undertaking; and these defections caused the whole army to dissolve and return to their homes. But the Boeotians and Chalcidians endeavored to carry out their part of the plan. The Boeotians occupied Oenoe and Hysiae on the Attic frontier near Plataea; and the Chalcidians crossed the Euripus and began to devastate the eastern part of Attica. Invaded thus on all sides, the Athenians at first resolved to concentrate their forces to withstand the

Peloponnesian attack on the side of Eleusis, leaving the Boeotians and Chalcidians to be dealt with later. But as soon as the breaking up of the Peloponnesian army relieved them from danger in that quarter, they marched instantly towards the Euripus, to prevent the junction of the Chalcidians with the Boeotians, intending to attack the Chalcidians first. The rapid arrival, however, of the Boeotians compelled them to alter their scheme; and an engagement was brought on at once, in which the Boeotians were completely defeated, losing 700 prisoners. On the same day the Athenians crossed over to Euboea, and gained another decisive victory over the Chalcidians, taking many prisoners. The date of these events is not quite certain. Thirlwall places them in 508, a writer in Smith's dictionary in 506. Clinton does not mention them at all.

We pass now to the year 445. The Athenian power in continental Greece had just received a fatal blow in the defeat of Tolmides at Coronea. This event, however, increased the reputation of Pericles; as it was well known that he had urged Tolmides to delay his expedition till a larger force could be collected. Grote thus states the circumstances to which attention is directed: "The calamitous consequences of this defeat came upon Athens in thick and rapid succession. The united exiles, having carried their point in Boeotia, proceeded to expel the philo-Athenian government both from Phokis and Lokris, and to carry the flame of revolt into Euboea. To this important island Pericles himself proceeded forthwith; but before he had time to complete the reconquest he was summoned home by news of a still more formidable character. The Megarians had revolted from Athens . . . As if to make the Athenians at once sensible how seriously this disaster affected them, by throwing open the road over Geraneia, Plistoanax, king of Sparta, was announced as already on his march for an invasion of Attica. He did indeed conduct an army, of mixed Lacedaemonians and Peloponnesian allies, into Attica, as far as the neighborhood of Eleusis and the Thriasian plain. He was a very young man, so that a Spartan of mature years, Kleandrides, had been attached to him by the Ephors as adjutant and counsellor. Pericles, it is said, persuaded both the one and the other by means of large bribes to evacuate Attica without advancing to Athens . . . So soon as the Lacedaemonians had retired from Attica, Pericles returned with his forces to Euboea and reconquered the island completely."

It is to be noticed that there are several circumstances of similarity in these two narratives. In each we have Athens compelled to struggle at once with enemies on both sides; in each we have a Peloponnesian army under a Spartan king advancing as far as Eleusis and then retreating without striking a blow; in each we have an expedition against Euboea suddenly arrested in order to meet a more pressing emergency and then resumed with complete success.

Herodotus (V 77) tells us that when the Chalcidians were defeated the Athenians settled four thousand of their own citizens as Kleruchs on the lands of the Chalcidian nobles, who bore the name of *ἵπποβοται*. In speaking of the results of the expedition of Pericles, Thucydides (I 114) says that he reduced the whole island, receiving the submission of the greater part, but driving out the people of Hestiaea from their territory and occupying it with Athenian settlers. Plutarch (Per. 23) explains that the reason of this severity to the Hestiaeans was that they had taken an Athenian ship and put the crew to death.

I come now to the point in which I think it probable that Plutarch has made a mistake. After telling us (Per. 23) that Pericles crossed over to Euboea with 50 ships and 5000 hoplites and reduced the cities, he says: "And those of the Chalcidians who were called hippobotae, pre-eminent in wealth and reputation, he drove out: *Χαλκιδέων μὲν τοὺς ἵπποβότας λεγομένους πλούτῳ καὶ δόξῃ διαφέροντας ἐξέβαλεν*. In their accounts of these proceedings Thirlwall, Grote, and Curtius take this statement from Plutarch. Thirlwall indeed uses the expression that these nobles 'were again deprived of their estates,' showing that he bore in mind the account in Herodotus of what had occurred some fifty years previously. But neither Grote nor Curtius makes any reference to the earlier expulsion of these same hippobotae. I think it probable that Plutarch was misled by the similarity of the circumstances of the two expeditions which I have pointed out, to join together their results and attribute them to the later expedition of which he gives an account. It may of course be said that in the interval that elapsed between these defeats the nobles of Chalcis had possibly succeeded in regaining their estates and re-establishing their influence. But of this there is no evidence; and it is in the highest degree improbable. The Athenians, we are told, sent 4000 of their own citizens to occupy these lands. We hear of them again as still in possession of them at the time of the battle of Marathon in

490. Herodotus (VI 100) tells us that before Datis and Artaphernes reached Euboea, the people of Eretria, knowing that they were to be attacked, sent to Athens and begged for assistance. The Athenians, we are told, did not reject their petition, but assigned as their auxiliaries the 4000 who as cleruchs were occupying the lands of the Chalcidian hippobotae. But these men found that owing to internal divisions and probable treason the Eretrians had no chance of successfully resisting the Persians—*τῶν Ἐρετρίων ἦν ἄρα οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς βούλευμα*—and accordingly they acted on the advice of a certain Aeschines, *ἐὼν τῶν Ἐρετρίων τὰ πρῶτα*, and crossed over to Oropus and so saved themselves. The Persians took Eretria by treason, carried off the inhabitants, and without spending more time in Euboea went at once to the plain of Marathon. Of course one may believe, if he chooses, that these Athenian cleruchs did not return, after the defeat of the Persians, to their estates, which they had been occupying for some sixteen or eighteen years. But this seems to me exceedingly unlikely. We are not told that the Persians in any way devastated the territory of Chalcis during their stay in Euboea; and there could have been no reason why the Athenian settlers should not return to their farms as soon as the danger of the Persian invasion was past. Boeckh (Publ. Ec. I, p. 557; E. T., p. 548) speaks of the retreat of these cleruchs before the battle of Marathon—to Athens, he says; but Herodotus says to Oropus—and is convinced that they returned and resumed possession of their lands. It is true that on the same page he says, following the statement of Plutarch, that hippobotae were again found by Pericles in Chalcis and expelled by him. But he does not attempt to show how, if, as he believes, the Athenian cleruchs were still in possession of their lands, there could have been room for another set of hippobotae to exist there of sufficient importance to be specially mentioned as dispossessed. During the whole period intervening between the battle of Marathon and the defeat of Tolmides at Coronea the Athenian power had been steadily augmenting; and it is hard to believe that, when such a large body of Athenian citizens was permanently settled presumably on the best lands of the Lelantian plain, any considerable number of the old nobility could have succeeded in establishing themselves. When we add to this inherent improbability the silence of Thucydides as to any such expulsion of hippobotae, the probability is greatly increased that Plutarch has fallen into an error, perhaps led to it in the way I have suggested. Indeed the words

of Thucydides have more weight than is due to simple silence. For he says τὴν μὲν ἄλλην ὁμολογία κατεστήσαντο Ἑστιαῖας δὲ ἐξοικίσαντες αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον. These words imply that the only part of the island treated with exceptional severity was the district of Hestiaeae. If Thucydides had been aware of any such expulsion of the landholding class from Chalcis, as our historians assume on the authority of that passage of Plutarch, I do not think he could have expressed himself in this way.¹

C. D. MORRIS.

¹ The conclusion arrived at above is strongly confirmed by the opening words of the inscription (C. I. A. I Suppl. p. 10, Hicks p. 33) which records the arrangements made by the Athenians with the Chalcidians immediately after the reduction of Euboea by Pericles. The Athenian βουλή and δικασταί are to swear—οὐκ ἐξελῶ Χαλκιδίας ἐχ Χαλκίδος οὐδὲ τὴν πόλιν ἀνάστατον ποιήσω. This decree would be an intolerable mockery if, just before it was passed, the most eminent class of the Chalcidians had been expelled.